

MH MPG Report 1541-TR 12

28 January 1964

9p.
Honeywell

N64-16742

CODE-1
CR-53099

MH MPG Report 1541-TR 12

ROCKET BOOSTER CONTROL

SECTION 12

STATE DETERMINATION FOR
A FLEXIBLE VEHICLE WITHOUT
A MODE SHAPE REQUIREMENT

NASA Contract NASw-563

OTS PRICE

XEROX

MICROFILM

\$

\$

1.10 pl.
0.80 pf.

MILITARY PRODUCTS GROUP RESEARCH DEPARTMENT

(NASA CR-53099;

MH-MPG Report 1541-TR-12)

OTS: 81.10 ph, 80.80 mf

28 January 1964

92 ref

ROCKET BOOSTER CONTROL,

SECTION 12/

STATE DETERMINATION FOR
A FLEXIBLE VEHICLE WITHOUT
A MODE SHAPE REQUIREMENT. 2*

(NASA Contract NASw-563)

Prepared by:

E. E. Fisher

E. E. Fisher

Research Scientist

Supervised by:

C. R. Stone

C. R. Stone

Research Supervisor

Approved by:

O. H. Schuck

O. H. Schuck

Director

MPG Research

1555 291

~~1555 291~~

Minneapolis - HONEYWELL Regulator Co., Minn.

② MILITARY PRODUCTS GROUP RESEARCH DEPARTMENT

Minneapolis, Minnesota

FOREWORD

This document is one of sixteen sections that comprise the final report prepared by the Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Company for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under contract NASw-563. The report is issued in the following sixteen sections to facilitate updating as progress warrants:

- 1541-TR 1 Summary
- 1541-TR 2 Control of Plants Whose Representation Contains Derivatives of the Control Variable
- 1541-TR 3 Modes of Finite Response Time Control
- 1541-TR 4 A Sufficient Condition in Optimal Control
- 1541-TR 5 Time Optimal Control of Linear Recurrence Systems
- 1541-TR 6 Time-Optimal Bounded Phase Coordinate Control of Linear Recurrence Systems
- 1541-TR 7 Penalty Functions and Bounded Phase Coordinate Control
- 1541-TR 8 Linear Programming and Bounded Phase Coordinate Control
- 1541-TR 9 Time Optimal Control with Amplitude and Rate Limited Controls
- 1541-TR 10 A Concise Formulation of a Bounded Phase Coordinate Control Problem as a Problem in the Calculus of Variations
- 1541-TR 11 A Note on System Truncation
- 1541-TR 12 State Determination for a Flexible Vehicle Without a Mode Shape Requirement
- 1541-TR 13 An Application of the Quadratic Penalty Function Criterion to the Determination of a Linear Control for a Flexible Vehicle
- 1541-TR 14 Minimum Disturbance Effects Control of Linear Systems with Linear Controllers
- 1541-TR 15 An Alternate Derivation and Interpretation of the Drift-Minimum Principle
- 1541-TR 16 A Minimax Control for a Plant Subjected to a Known Load Disturbance

Section 1 (1541-TR 1) provides the motivation for the study efforts and objectively discusses the significance of the results obtained. The results of inconclusive and/or unsuccessful investigations are presented. Linear programming is reviewed in detail adequate for sections 6, 8, and 16.

It is shown in section 2 that the purely formal procedure for synthesizing an optimum bang-bang controller for a plant whose representation contains derivatives of the control variable yields a correct result.

In section 3 it is shown that the problem of controlling m components ($1 < m \leq n$), of the state vector for an n -th order linear constant coefficient plant, to zero in finite time can be reformulated as a problem of controlling a single component.

Section 4 shows Pontriagin's Maximum Principle is often a sufficient condition for optimal control of linear plants.

Section 5 develops an algorithm for computing the time optimal control functions for plants represented by linear recurrence equations. Steering may be to convex target sets defined by quadratic forms.

In section 6 it is shown that linear inequality phase constraints can be transformed into similar constraints on the control variables. Methods for finding controls are discussed.

Existence of and approximations to optimal bounded phase coordinate controls by use of penalty functions are discussed in section 7.

In section 8 a maximum principle is proven for time-optimal control with bounded phase constraints. An existence theorem is proven. The problem solution is reduced to linear programming.

A backing-out-of-the-origin procedure for obtaining trajectories for time-optimal control with amplitude and rate limited control variables is presented in section 9.

Section 10 presents a reformulation of a time-optimal bounded phase coordinate problem into a standard calculus of variations problem.

A mathematical method for assessing the approximation of a system by a lower order representation is presented in section 11.

Section 12 presents a method for determination of the state of a flexible vehicle that does not require mode shape information.

The quadratic penalty function criterion is applied in section 13 to develop a linear control law for a flexible rocket booster.

In section 14 a method for feedback control synthesis for minimum load disturbance effects is derived. Examples are presented.

Section 15 shows that a linear fixed gain controller for a linear constant coefficient plant may yield a certain type of invariance to disturbances. Conditions for obtaining such invariance are derived using the concept of complete controllability. The drift minimum condition is obtained as a specific example.

In section 16 linear programming is used to determine a control function that minimizes the effects of a known load disturbance.

STATE DETERMINATION FOR A FLEXIBLE
VEHICLE WITHOUT A MODE SHAPE REQUIREMENT*

By E. E. Fisher[†]

ABSTRACT

A problem involving state determination for a flexible vehicle without known mode shapes is considered. Conditions are established which allow a least squares estimate of certain system parameters. Knowledge of these parameters allows state determination.

INTRODUCTION

The motion of a flexible vehicle is assumed given by the equation

$$\dot{x} = Ax + bu \quad (1)$$

where x is an n -vector representing the state of the system, u is a scalar control variable, A is a constant n by n matrix, and b is a constant n -vector. The system is considered to be controllable, which is taken to mean that the vectors $A^{n-1}b, A^{n-2}b, \dots, Ab, b$ are linearly independent**. A vector z which is related to x by a non-singular transformation

$$z = Mx \quad (2)$$

is observable (capable of being measured). M is a constant non-singular n by n matrix which depends on mode shape data but is unknown. The matrices A and b are assumed known. Time histories of z and u are assumed given. Conditions are sought which allow the determination of the matrix M from the known data.

* Prepared under contract NASw-563 for the NASA

[†] Research Scientist, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Company,
Minneapolis, Minnesota.

** See for instance reference 1

This would allow estimation of x by the equation

$$x = M^{-1}z \quad (3)$$

ANALYSIS

Use is made of equations 1,2, and 3 to yield an equation of motion for z given by

$$\dot{z} = MAM^{-1}z + Mbu. \quad (4)$$

The substitution

$$C \triangleq MAM^{-1}, d \triangleq Mb \quad (5)$$

reduces equation (4) to

$$\dot{z} = Cz + du. \quad (6)$$

Finally, this is written as the integral equation

$$z(t) - z(t_0) = C \int_{t_0}^t z(\tau) d\tau + d \int_{t_0}^t u(\tau) d\tau. \quad (7)$$

If the components of the vector $z(t) - z(t_0)$ are denoted by

$f_1(t), f_2(t), \dots, f_n(t)$, the components of the vector

$\int_{t_0}^t z(\tau) d\tau$ are denoted by $g_1(t), g_2(t), \dots, g_n(t)$, and $\int_{t_0}^t u(\tau) d\tau$ is

denoted by $v(t)$, then equation 7 takes the component form

$$f_1(t) = c_{11}g_1(t) + c_{12}g_2(t) + \dots + c_{1n}g_n(t) + d_1v(t) \quad (8)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$

Since the functions $g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n, f_1, \dots, f_n, v$ are known functions or integrals of known functions, they are known.

Suppose that by comparison of the known functions g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n, v with the functions f_1 it were possible to determine the matrices C and d . Then the matrix M would be known because M satisfies the equation

$$L = MN \text{ or } M = LN^{-1} \quad (9)$$

where L is a matrix with columns $d, Cd, C^2d, \dots, C^{n-1}d$; and N is a matrix with columns $b, Ab, A^2b, \dots, A^{n-1}b$. The matrix N is non-singular because the vectors $b, Ab, A^2b, \dots, A^{n-1}b$ are linearly independent.

The remainder of the analysis is devoted to establishing a sufficient condition which allows the estimation of the matrices C and d by the method of least squares.

Minimization with respect to c_{ij} and d_i of the n error functions E_1, E_2, \dots, E_n given by

$$E_i = \int_{t_0}^T [f_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n c_{ij} g_j(t) - d_i v(t)]^2 dt \quad (9)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ will yield n sets of $n+1$ linear equations for the unknowns c_{ij} and d_i . In the event that the functions g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n , and v are linearly independent these equations will be soluble for c_{ij} and d_i . A condition which is sufficient to insure this linear independence is now established.

Since the set of functions g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n, v are integrals of the functions z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n, u they are linearly independent if and only if the latter are. The latter set is, however, obtained from the state components and control variable, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, u by a non-singular linear transformation. These are linearly independent if and only if the state components and the control variable are linearly independent. It will now be shown that a requirement for non-linearity of the controller is sufficient to insure this linear independence.

A controller $u = u(x)$ will be called non-linear if u is not given by an equation of the form

$$u = k_1 x_1 + k_2 x_2 + \dots + k_n x_n \quad (9)$$

where k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n are constants and the equation holds identically in time.

The common linear feedback controller is not non-linear. On the other hand, a bang-bang controller is non-linear. This is seen by a continuity argument. The zero function is seen to be a linear controller with $k_1 = k_2 = \dots = k_n = 0$. The following theorem finishes the discussion.

THEOREM. Let x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n be state vector components and let $u = u(x)$ be a control variable which together satisfy equation (1). Let the system given by equation (1) be controllable. Then if the controller $u = u(x)$ is a non-linear controller the functions x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, u will be linearly independent.

PROOF: The functions x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, u will be linearly independent if and only if there is no non-trivial linear relationship between them. Thus it is sufficient to prove that the truth of a linear relationship $e_1 x_1 + e_2 x_2 + \dots + e_n x_n + e_{n+1} u = 0$ necessarily implies that $e_1 = e_2 = \dots = e_n = e_{n+1} = 0$.

The truth of a linear relationship with e_{n+1} nonzero would imply that u was a linear combination of x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n ; that is that u was a linear controller. Since this has been excluded, it must be that $e_{n+1} = 0$.

A linear relationship $e_1 x_1 + e_2 x_2 + \dots + e_n x_n = 0$ is thus assumed true and it is shown that this implies $e_1 = e_2 = \dots = e_n = 0$. $e = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n)$ is taken as a row matrix and the relationship

is written in matrix form as $ex = 0$. On differentiation this yields $e\dot{x} = 0$. Then by use of equation (1) $eAx + ebu = 0$. Because u is a non-linear controller, it must be that $eb = 0$. Thus, $eAx = 0$ and by differentiation $eA\dot{x} = 0$. This, by equation 1, yields $eA^2x + eAb = 0$. Because u is a non-linear controller, it must also be that $eAb = 0$. Continuing in this manner there results $eb = 0, eAb = 0, \dots, eA^{n-1}b = 0$. That is, e is orthogonal to n linearly independent n -dimensional vectors, i.e., e is the zero vector, which was to be proved.

CONCLUSIONS

It has been demonstrated that, given a controllable plant with non-linear controller and given time histories of n functions z_1 which depend on the state components x_1 through a non-singular linear transformation, it is possible by the method of least squares to establish the matrix of the transformation. The demonstration establishes, for the flexible vehicle problem, the possibility of an "adaptive system" capable of state determination without complete knowledge of mode shapes.

REFERENCES

1. Kalman, R. E., "On The General Theory Of Control Systems", Proc. of First International Congress on Automatic Control, Moscow, 1960, pp. 481-493